REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated November 28, 2008, the Applicant has amended claims 1 and 18. Claims 1-8 and 18-23 are in the case. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 7 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Laverty et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,791,707). The Office Action rejected claims 5-6, 8 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Laverty et al. in view of FedEx.

The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and contends that the Laverty et al. reference alone or in combination with FedEx does not disclose, teach or suggest all of the elements of the Applicant's newly amended independent claims.

Namely, the combined references do not disclose, teach or suggest the Applicant's newly amended dynamically and automatically creating a document profile for the document file based on specific requirements defined at the designer location and particular capabilities of devices at the print service provider location and applying the dynamically created document profile to the document file, automatically adjusting characteristics of the document file based on the dynamically created document profile and creating a job ticket at the designer location that specifies production devices of the print service provider to be used to process the print job and processing instructions for the print service provider location.

Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, and in particular, in paragraphs [0021] - [0023] and of the Applicant's published patent application, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0030556.

In contrast, Laverty et al. merely disclose an on-line automated printing system that includes a front-end customer setup and product setup modules available on a web server (see Abstract and Summary of the Invention of Laverty et al.) while FedEx simply discloses package tracking services. Although a Print Ready

File is produced embodying the product to be printed in Laverty et al., Laverty et al. alone or in combination with FedEx do **not** disclose, teach or suggest features of the Applicant's **newly amended** independent claims.

In particular, Laverty et al., alone or in combination with FedEx, is missing the Applicant's newly added **dynamically and automatically creating** a document profile for the document file based on specific requirements defined at the designer location particular capabilities of devices at print service provider location, **applying the dynamically** created document **profile** to the document file and **automatically adjusting** characteristics of the document file based on the dynamically created document profile **and** creating a job ticket at the designer location that **specifies production devices** of the print service provider to be used to process the print job and processing instructions for the print service provider location

Instead, Laverty et al. merely disclose at col. 10, lines 39-45 a customer selecting and ordering a particular product through the web site and the web site loading a pre-configured order form for the selected product, **the web site then transmits the data to the system which generates the Print Ready File** (e.g., as a unique PostScript file). A customer "inputs data" to be printed on a web site of the printer (see col. 10, lines 26-29 of Laverty et al.) input data is input in a "pre-configured order form" (see col. 10, lines 40-43 of Laverty et al.) while FedEx simply discloses package tracking.

Consequently, Laverty et al. alone or in combination with FedEx or do not disclose, teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed. Therefore, because the Laverty et al. reference alone or in combination with FedEx is missing at least one feature of the independent claims, the Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness does not exist. As a result, the independent claims are patentable over Laverty et al. As such, withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

Further, with regard to the dependent claims, since they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, they are therefore patentable on the same basis. (MPEP § 2143.03). As such, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly **requests** the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at **(818) 885-1575**. Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to:

Hewlett Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: March 2, 2009
By
/Edmond A. DeFrank/
Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicant
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX